UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/642,462	08/15/2003	Daniele Piomelli	02307E-125510US	2152
TOWNSEND AND TOWNSEND AND CREW, LLP TWO EMBARCADERO CENTER			EXAMINER	
			THOMAS, TIMOTHY P	
EIGHTH FLOOR SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94111-3834			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1614	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			03/18/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)			
	10/642,462	PIOMELLI ET AL.			
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit			
	TIMOTHY P. THOMAS	1614			
The MAILING DATE of this communication app Period for Reply	ears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence address			
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DA - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period w - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tim vill apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from cause the application to become ABANDONE	N. nely filed the mailing date of this communication. D (35 U.S.C. § 133).			
Status					
Responsive to communication(s) filed on 13 No. This action is FINAL . 2b) ☑ This Since this application is in condition for allowar closed in accordance with the practice under E.	action is non-final. nce except for formal matters, pro				
Disposition of Claims					
4) Claim(s) 1-22 and 25-36 is/are pending in the a 4a) Of the above claim(s) 1-15,32 and 34-36 is/ 5) Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) Claim(s) 16-22,25-31 and 33 is/are rejected. 7) Claim(s) 19 is/are objected to. 8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or Application Papers 9) The specification is objected to by the Examine 10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) acceeding a content of the co	r election requirement. r. epted or b) □ objected to by the E	≣xaminer.			
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).					
11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Ex	aminer. Note the attached Office	Action or form PTO-152.			
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119					
 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received. 					
Attachment(s) 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date 3/17/2004; 10/5/2007.	4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail Da 5) Notice of Informal P 6) Other:	nte			

Art Unit: 1614

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Arguments

- 1. Applicants' arguments, filed 11/13/2007 and 10/5/2007, have been fully considered but they are not deemed to be persuasive. Rejections and/or objections not reiterated from previous office actions are hereby withdrawn. The following rejections and/or objections are either reiterated or newly applied. They constitute the complete set presently being applied to the instant application.
- 2. Applicant's arguments, see pp.12-14, filed 10/5/2007, with respect to the rejection(s) of claim(s) 16-22, 26-31 and 33 under 35 USC 102(b) have been fully considered and are persuasive. Therefore, the rejection has been withdrawn. However, upon further consideration, a new ground(s) of rejection is made under 35 USC 103, which is outlined below.
- 3. Applicant's arguments, see p. 14, 3rd-4th paragraphs, filed 10/5/2007, with respect to the double patenting rejection have been fully considered and are persuasive. The provisional rejection of claims 16-31 and 33 has been withdrawn.

Claim Objections

- 4. Claim 19 is objected to under 37 CFR 1.75(c), as being of improper dependent form for failing to further limit the subject matter of a previous claim. Applicant is required to cancel the claim(s), or amend the claim(s) to place the claim(s) in proper dependent form, or rewrite the claim(s) in independent form.
- 5. Claim 19 depicts a formula with substituents that do not fall into any category of nor further limit the R_2 and R_3 groups of the claim 18 structure.

Art Unit: 1614

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

6. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

- 7. The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham* **v.** *John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:
 - 1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
 - 2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
 - 3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
 - 4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.
- 8. This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).
- 9. Claims 16-22, 25-31, 33 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over de Fonseca, et al. ("An anorexic lipid mediator regulated by feeding"; 2001 Nov; Nature; 414:209-212) and Di Marzo, et al. ("Leptin-regulated")

Art Unit: 1614

endocannabinoids are involved in maintaining food intake"; 2001 Apr; Nature; 410: 822-825).

De Fonseca teaches oleylethanolamide (OEA) administration causes a decrease in food intake and a decrease in body mass gain (abstract; p. 209, Figures 1 & 2); OEA was administered daily 15 minutes before food presentation (parenteral administration of a unit dose; p. 211, Feeding Experiments section). De Fonseca does not teach the combination of OEA with rimonabant in a pharmaceutical composition. Di Marzo teaches CB1 knockout mice and mice to which the CB1 antagonist SR141716A (rimonabant) had been administered reduced food intake in the mice (abstract; p. 822, 1st paragraph, Figure 1). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine OEA and rimonavant into a pharmaceutical composition for reduction of food intake and decrease in body mass in a unit dosage format for parenteral or oral administration to give the pharmaceutical composition of the instant claims. The motivation to combine the ingredients is their art-recognized equivalent activities in the reduction of food intake. The motivation to formulate an oral unit dosage formulation would be the ease of administration at a set interval before meals and the resulting patient compliance to a therapy regimen. The criteria recited in claim 25 would be inherent property of the specific combination including the elected compounds.

Conclusion

10. No claim is allowed.

Art Unit: 1614

11. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

examiner should be directed to TIMOTHY P. THOMAS whose telephone number is

(571)272-8994. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday 6:30 a.m.

- 5:00 p.m..

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, Ardin Marschel can be reached on (571) 272-0718. The fax phone number

for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the

Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for

published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR.

Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only.

For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should

you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic

Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a

USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information

system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Timothy P Thomas/

Examiner, Art Unit 1614

/Ardin Marschel/

Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 1614